

Request for Reconsideration under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. Appln. No. 09/857,020

**Argument**

In regard to the rejection of claims 8-10, Applicant submits that the proposed combination of Saganuma and Suzuki et al. fails to teach or suggest a method of controlling a frequency set value of a device under control as required by the claims. Specifically, the prior art does not disclose determining whether a pulse generator is generating pulses and if it is determined in that an operation mode is a monitor mode and it is determined in that the pulse generator is generating pulses, modifying the operation mode to be frequency setting mode, as claimed in independent claim 8.

The Examiner asserts, on pages 2 and 3 of the office action, that Saganuma teaches a pulse generator that generates pulses in response to the speed of a rotor and a drive speed setting circuit that determines and amplifies the difference between the voltage signal from a frequency-to-voltage (F/V) converter and a reference supply voltage. However, even assuming, *arguendo*, that the Examiner is correct, this does not meet all the requirements of the particular claim recitation. In particular, merely generating pulses in response to the speed of a rotor and setting the drive speed of a motor based on the difference between the output voltage of the F/V converter and a reference voltage is not the same as changing an operation mode to be frequency setting mode if it is determined that a current mode of operation is a monitor mode and also that pulses are being generated. In fact, Saganuma does not disclose any mode-dependent actions at all. For at least this reason, the proposed combination of Saganuma and Suzuki et al. fails to render any of claims 8-10 obvious.

Furthermore, Applicant submits that the asserted combination of prior art fails to teach or suggest determining a change in frequency with respect to the pulses and modifying the

Request for Reconsideration under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. Appln. No. 09/857,020

frequency set value for the device under control based on the change in frequency. The Examiner asserts that Suzuki et al. teaches a frequency determination circuit, in FIG. 3, including an oscillating circuit the output frequency of which is determined in accordance with an output level of a pulse voltage converting circuit. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's assessment of the circuit shown in FIG. 3 of Suzuki et al. For example, neither FIG. 3 nor its attendant description disclose determining a change in the frequency of pulses. Indeed, FIG. 3 includes a comparator 13, which "functions as a phase comparator" (Col. 3, line 26-27). However, phase is not the same a frequency and, further, the comparator shown determines a *difference between the phase of an input signal and a reference signal* (VA), not a *change in the frequency of pulses*, as claimed.

Additionally, because Suzuki et al fails to disclose determining a change in frequency of pulses, Applicant submits that Suzuki et al. also fails to disclose modifying the frequency set value for the device under control based on the change in frequency. For this additional reason, Applicant submits that the proposed combination of Saganuma and Suzuki et al. fails to teach or suggest the subject matter claimed in claim 8 and the rejection thereto should be withdrawn.

Applicant submits that claims 9 and 10 are patentable over the proposed combination at least by virtue of their dependency on patentable claim 8.

In regard to independent claims 11 and 13, Applicant submits that the subject matter of these claims is patentable for at least the same reason as set forth above in regard to claim 8. Specifically, Applicant submits that the asserted combination of prior art fails to teach or suggest structure that determines a change in frequency with respect to the pulses and structure that

Request for Reconsideration under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. Appln. No. 09/857,020

modifies the frequency set value for the device under control based on the change in frequency.

For at least this reason, claims 11-13 are patentable over the proposed combination of Suganuma and Suzuki et al. and the rejection thereto should be withdrawn.

***Conclusion***

In view of the foregoing remarks, the application is believed to be in form for immediate allowance with claims 1-13, and such action is hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, he is kindly requested to **contact the undersigned** at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Kevin M. Barner  
Registration No. 46,075

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE  
23373  
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: October 26, 2004

Attorney Docket No.: Q64727